

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes replacement Figure 3.

Attachment at the end of this response: Replacement Sheet for Figure 3.

**Remarks/Arguments**

The drawings are objected to.

[001] Figure 3 has been amended to insert the wording from the specification at paragraph 21 wherein the index variation is described. The figure now recites “varying the index within the LUT that is used for indexing of the predistortion data stored therein ...”

It is respectfully submitted that the drawings now meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.83(b).

The claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as being insufficient to enable “varying the index within the lookup table.”

Claim 1 is amended to read “varying the index within the LUT that is used for indexing of the predistortion data stored therein ...” thereby clarifying the wording thereof. The wording is taken from paragraph 21 of the specification and, as such, adds no new matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the objection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Tiittanen (US 5,371,481) in view of Lee (US 6,246,865).

It is alleged that Tiittanen teaches a LUT for signal compensation. There is no teaching in Tiittanen of varying an index to the LUT. Though, Tiittanen teaches varying contents of the LUT and using the LUT in some way but does not vary the index to the LUT for indexing of predistortion data stored therein.

Therefore the claims are not obvious over Tiittanen and Lee.

Claims 1-3, 6, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Kim (US 2004/0017257) in view of Lee (US 6,246,865).

Similarly, it is alleged that the combination of Kim and Lee teaches varying an index to the LUT but it is not clear from the references how the index is varied or that it is varied for indexing of predistortion data stored therein.

Therefore the claims are not obvious over Kim and Lee.

Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Chiesa et al (US 5,524,296) in view of Lee (US 6,246,865).

Similarly, it is alleged that the combination of Chiesa and Lee teaches varying an index to the LUT but it is not clear from the references how the index is varied or that it is varied for indexing of predistortion data stored therein.

Therefore the claims are not obvious over Chiesa and Lee.

Claims 9, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Chiesa in view of Lee and further in view of Shi (US 6,819,910).

Claims 9 and 17 cannot be obvious if they depend from allowable base claims.

No new matter has been added in the amended claims.

Applicant looks forward to favourable reconsideration of the present application.

A Petition for Extension of Time is filed concurrently with this response.

**Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit  
Account No: 20-1430.**

Respectfully submitted,

*Aaron S. Kamlay, No. 58,813*  
for Gary Morris, Reg. No. 40,735

GF/dll(ds)

Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP  
601 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
South Building, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004-2601  
U.S.A.

Tel.: (202) 434-8195  
Fax: (202) 434-8171

Enclosure: Replacement sheet for Fig. 3